Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheets of drawings include changes to Figs. 1c, 3a, 3b, 5 and 7. These sheets, which include Figs. 1-7, replace the original sheets including Figs. 1-7.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets
Annotated Sheets Showing Changes

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-30 were pending in the application, of which claims 16, 17, 20-25, 29 and 30 are withdrawn. Applicant has canceled claims 10-12, 26 and 28. Applicant has also presented new claim 31. Therefore, claims 1-9, 13-25, 27 and 29-31 are now pending in the application, of which claims 16, 17, 20-25, 29 and 30 are withdrawn.

The drawings have been objected to for not showing every feature specified in the claims. In particular, the drawings have been objected to for not showing a rupturable region as recited in claim 4. Applicant has amended Fig. 3a to show a rupturable region 100. Regarding the remaining objections to the drawings based on claims 10, 12, and 26, Applicant has canceled claims 10-12, 26 and 28. The drawings have been further objected to for not showing proper cross-sectional shading in Figs. 3a, 3b, 5 and 7. Additionally, the drawings have been objected to for the section line "A-A" in Fig. 1c not being labeled as "3A-3A." Applicant has amended these drawings to show the proper cross-sectional shading and to correct the label of the section line in Fig. 1c to 3A-3A. Based on the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that the objection to the drawings be withdrawn.

The Abstract has been objected to in the office action. Applicant has amended the abstract to address each part of the Abstract upon which the objection is based. Applicant requests that the objection to the Abstract be withdrawn.

The disclosure has been objected to for being unclear as to what structure described in the specification comprises the lifting rail, the position detent elements of the lifting rail, the slide members, the first, second and third guide ways. Applicant has canceled claims 10-12, 26 and 28, in which the noted structures were recited. Applicant has also amended the specification to change "AA" to "3A-3A" so that the description of the section line shown in Fig. 1c corresponds with the amendment to Fig. 1c as discussed above. Based on the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that the objection to the specification be withdrawn.

Claims 10-12, 26 and 28 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, for the specification being non-enabling. Applicant has canceled claims 10-12, 26 and 28.

Claims 1-13, 15, 18, 19, 26-28 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Applicant has canceled claims 10-12, 26 and 28. On pages 6-10 of the office action, the Examiner has listed a number of claim limitations which he believes to be indefinite. Applicant has amended the claims to address each of the limitations discussed on pages 6-10 of the office action. Therefore, Applicant believes that claims 1-9, 13, 15, 18, 19, and 27 overcome the indefiniteness rejections.

Claims 1-9 and 27 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over Sambor (US 5,058,322). Claim 1 recites wherein the second guide element is held in an assembly position relative to at least one of the first guide element and another element of the follower through associated engagement regions, and wherein at least for assembly, the first guide element and the second guide element are movably mounted relative to each other so that at least the second guide element can be brought from the assembly position into a functioning position on the guide way of the guide plate. In contrast, Sambor does not teach or suggest the noted limitations of claim 1.

Referring to FIG. 1 of Sambor, the actuator of Sambor includes a spindle portion 26 and a drive pulley 42. The drive pulley 42 includes a central through-bore 46 for receiving a mounting fastener such as the pin indicated at 48 for insertion in the aperture 36 of the spindle 26 to fixedly secure the drive pulley 42 with respect to the spindle 26. *(See Sambor at col. 3, lines 4-9).* However, as shown in FIG. 1 of Sambor, the spindle 26 and the drive pulley 42 are not held in an assembly position relative to each other through any engagement regions. Furthermore, the spindle 26 and the pulley 42 are not moveable relative to each other so that one can be brought from the assembly position into a functioning position on the guide way 62. Once the spindle 26 is securely fixed to the drive pulley 42 with the pin 48, the drive pulley 42 cannot rotate relative to the spindle 26 in order to force the spindle 26 and the pulley 42 to move together along the guideway 62 with the pulling of the cable. *(See Sambor at col. 3, lines 50-60).* Even when the spindle 26 rotates in the enlarged portion 66, the pulley 26 rotates with the spindle 26. *(See*

Sambor at col. 3, line 65 to col. 4, line 6). Thus, Applicant submits that once the spindle 26 and the drive pulley 42 of Sambor are held together or mounted together with the pin 48 on the guide way 62, they are not movable relative to each other.

Based on the foregoing, Applicant believes that claim 1 and dependent claims 2-9 and 27 are patentable over Sambor.

Claims 14 and 15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over Gudmundsen (US 2,017,244). Claim 14 recites that the height of the guide web of the guide way is reduced in a region for assembling the follower. In contrast, Gudmundsen does not teach of suggest that the height of the guide web is reduced in a region for assembling the follower.

The Office action states on page 11 that Gudmundsen discloses a guide web 36 and the height of the guide web is "reduced in a region for assembling the follower 34 as shown in figure 7." Referring to Fig. 6 of Gudmundsen, the tracks 36 are formed by inwardly curling marginal edges of the slots 33. *(See page 2 of Gudmundsen, col. 2, lines 9-11).* As shown in Fig. 7, an enlargement 34 is provided by which the button 35 is entered between the tracks 36. In contrast to the reduced height of the guide web in a region for assembling the follower as recited in claim 14, the slot 33 provides an enlarged width portion, i.e., the enlargement, through which the button 35 can be entered. Furthermore, Gudmundsen does not teach or suggest that the inwardly curled marginal edges of the slot 33 which define the tracks 36 have reduced height at any portion along the slot. Additionally, Gudmundsen does not teach or suggest that the degree of inward curl of the marginal edges of the slots 33 is reduced at different portions of the slot in order to create a reduced height for the tracks 36.

Based on the foregoing, Applicant believes that Gudmundsen fails to teach or suggest that the height of the guide web of the guide way is reduced in a region for assembling the follower. Therefore, Applicant believes that claim 14 and dependent claim 15 are patentable over Gundmundsen.

Claims 10-12 and 28 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Sambor in view of Kobayashi et al., (US 4,633,613). Claims 10-12 and 28 have been canceled.

Claims 18 and 19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Sambor in view of Gudmundsen. Claim 18 recites wherein the second guide element is held in an assembly position relative to at least one of the first guide element and another element of the follower through associated engagement regions, and wherein at least for assembly the first guide element and the second guide element are movably mounted relative to each other so that at least the second guide element can be brought from the assembly position into a functioning position on the guide way of the guide plate. As described above in relation to the rejection of claim 1, Sambor fails to teach or suggest the noted limitations of claim 18. Therefore, Applicant believes that claim 18 and dependent claim 19 are patentable over Sambor in view of Gudmundsen.

Applicant has rewritten claim 13 in independent form so as to include the limitations of base claim 1. Furthermore, Applicant has amended claim 13 to overcome the indefiniteness rejections of this claims as discussed on page 9 of the Office action. Applicant believes that because claim 13 overcomes the indefiniteness rejection thereof, claim 13 is now in condition for allowance.

Applicant believes that claims 1-9, 13-25, 27 and 29-31 are in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,
CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP

By _____
Saeid Mirsafian
Reg. No. 52,035
626/795-9900

SM/mr